

Appl. No. 10/826534

REMARKS

The following remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed on November 16, 2004. Upon entrance of the amendments set out above, Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-34, and 37-98 remain pending in this application.

Claims 87-91 were rejected under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite because claim 87 is an apparatus claim and depended from a method claim. Claim 87 has been amended to depend from apparatus claim 83. Accordingly this rejection has been overcome.

All claims were rejected for obviousness-type double patenting over U.S. Patents 6,329,636 and 6,815,639. A terminal disclaimer directed to both of those patents is enclosed.

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application should be allowed. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned below if it will aid in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted



George R. Corrigan, Reg. No. 34,803
Corrigan Law Office
5 Briarcliff Court
Appleton, WI 54915
(920) 954-1099

*DN*G:\WP51\DOCS\ITW\8637.62\8637.62responsel.wpd Wednesday, February 16, 2005 2:19PM